

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the present application in view of the foregoing amendments and in view of the reasons that follow.

Claim 42 is currently being amended.

This amendment changes claims in this application. A detailed listing of all claims that are, or were, in the application, irrespective of whether the claim(s) remain under examination in the application, is presented, with an appropriate defined status identifier.

After amending the claims as set forth above, claims 42-56 are now pending in this application.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 42-56 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,745,574 (“Muftic”) in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0031230 (“Sweet et al.”) and in further view of Alfred J. Menezes et al., *Handbook of Applied Cryptography*, CRC Press, 1997, page 39 (“Menezes et al.”).

In response, without agreeing or acquiescing to the rejection, Applicant amends claim 42 to further define the invention. In addition, Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection for the reasons set forth below.

Applicant relies on M.P.E.P. § 2143, which states that to establish a prima facie case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation in the prior art to modify the reference. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Third, the prior art must teach or suggest all the claim limitations.

In the embodiment of claim 42, the method of communicating credentials comprises communicating a composite credential to a second party. The composite credential comprises a plurality of obfuscated credentials. Different obfuscation is used for at least two credentials in the composite credential. The second party de-obfuscates at least one credential. In addition, the second party communicates to a third party at least one obfuscated credential from the composite credential.

In contrast, the combination of Muftic, Sweet and Menezes et al. do not disclose, teach or suggest each and every limitation of independent claim 42 as amended. Muftic is directed to a security infrastructure for electronic transactions. Sweet is directed toward security management using a web-based application service model. Finally, Menezes et al. is a text book on general cryptography. The Menezes et al. reference relied on by the Examiner defines a “trusted third party” as “an entity in the network which is trusted by all other entities.” (See Menezes et al. at 36.) Menezes et al. discloses that if two entities (A_1 and A_5) wish to communicate with each other, the trusted third party must generate a session key to facilitate communication between A_1 and A_5 . (See FIG. 1.16). Once established A_1 communicates directly with A_5 . Thus, Menezes et al. teaches that “all communications require initial interaction with the “trusted third party.” (See Menezes et al. at 36.)

The requirements disclosed in Menezes et al. are at odds with the limitations of independent claim 42 as amended. As stated above, claim 42 recites that a first party communicates a composite credential to a second party. The second party de-obfuscates at least one credential. In addition, the second party can communicate to a third party at least one obfuscated credential from the composite credential. The communications between the first and third party as claimed do not require the steps of (1) establishing an initial interaction with a “trusted third party” and then (2) conducting direct communication between the first and third parties as taught in Menezes et al.. Instead, because of the composite credentials, direct communication between the first party and third party claimed in claim 42 is unnecessary. Moreover, claim 42 does not require the second party to provide a session key to the first party and third party as taught in Menzes. (See Fig. 1.16). Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the combination of Muftic, Sweet and Menzes fails to teach each and every element of claim 42 and request that the rejection be withdrawn.

Further, Applicant asserts that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103 in view of Menzes is not proper because the Examiner has not properly identified a suggestion or motivation in the prior art to modify either Muftic or Sweet with Menzes. Instead, the Examiner has merely drawn a conclusion that combining the Menzes reference with the Muftic and Sweet reference would have been obvious without any reasoning supported by the prior art. Thus, the rejection is improper for this additional reason and should be withdrawn.

In addition, claims 43-56 depend from independent claim 42 as amended and should be allowed for at least the reasons set forth above. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection be withdrawn and claims 43-56 be allowed.

Conclusion

Applicant believes that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,

Date 6/9/08

By 

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
Customer No.: 22879
Telephone: (202) 672-5485
Facsimile: (202) 672-5399

William T. Ellis
Registration No. 26,874